

Office-Supreme Court, U.S.  
FILED

APR 5 1963

JOHN F. DAVIS, CLERK

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**  
OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No. 529

**UNITED STATES, Appellant**

v.

**CARLO BIANCHI AND COMPANY, INC., Respondent**

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Claims

**BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT**

WILLIAM H. MATTHEWS  
Attorney for Respondent  
821 15th Street, N. W.  
Washington 5, D. C.

ROBERT F. BRADFORD  
STANLEY KELLER  
Of Counsel

## INDEX

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| <b>Question Presented .....</b>   | 1    |
| <b>Statutory Provisions Involved.....</b>   | 2    |
| <b>Statement Regarding Facts .....</b>  | 3    |
| <b>Summary of Argument .....</b>  | 3    |
| <b>Argument</b>   |      |
| <b>I. The Wunderlich Act was intended to restore the standards employed by the Court of Claims before the decision of this Court in United States v. Wunderlich in determining the finality of administrative decisions and was not intended to change its procedures for applying such standards .....</b> | 6    |
| <b>A. The original jurisdiction of the Court of Claims .....</b>  | 6    |
| <b>B. Court of Claims procedures in reviewing administrative decisions before the Wunderlich Act .....</b>  | 7    |
| <b>C. The legislative history of the Wunderlich Act shows that Congress had no intention of changing the usual procedures of the Court of Claims permitting the presentation of evidence <i>de novo</i> .....</b>   | 11   |
| <b>D. The language of the Wunderlich Act indicates no intention on the part of Congress to alter the procedure employed by the Court of Claims whereby it reviews the administrative decision based on evidence presented <i>de novo</i> .....</b>  | 27   |
| <b>E. To limit the Court of Claims to review of the administrative record would give the contractor only an illusory remedy and assign to the Court an impractical role .....</b>   | 36   |

|   | Page |
|---|------|
| II. The Board committed administrative irregularities warranting the Court of Claims to render its decision on the basis of evidence presented <i>de novo</i> ..... | 39   |
| A. The Appeals Board considered and relied on material evidence not made known to respondent .....  | 39   |
| B. Another administrative irregularity was the Board's lack of an adequate record ..  | 43   |
| Conclusion .....  | 44   |
| Appendix .....  | 1a   |

### CITATIONS

#### CASES:

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Acker v. United States, 298 U.S. 426 .....  | 32 |
| A. E. Barker & Co. of Cal. v. Gilinsky Fruit Co., 100 F. 2d 863 .....                             | 34 |
| Allied Paint and Color Works v. United States, 309 F. 2d 133 .....                                | 43 |
| Angelos Brokerage Co. v. Carlo Panno Fruit Co., 211 F. 2d 341 .....                               | 34 |
| Albina Marine Ironworks v. United States, 79 C. Cls. 714 .....                                    | 8  |
| Ambursen Dam Co. v. United States, 86 C. Cls. 478 ..  | 8  |
| Asheville Contracting Co. v. United States, 110 C. Cls. 459 .....                                 | 9  |
| Baruch Corp. v. United States, 92 C. Cls. 571 .....   | 8  |
| Bein v. United States, 101 C. Cls. 144 .....  | 9  |
| Consolidated Edison Company v. National Labor Rel. Bd., 305 U.S. 197 .....                        | 25 |
| Crowell v. Benson, 285 U.S. 22 .....  | 31 |
| DeArmas v. United States, 108 C. Cls. 436 .....   | 8  |
| General Casualty Company v. United States, 130 C. Cls. 520, cert. den. 349 U.S. 938 .....         | 9  |
| Great Lakes Co. v. United States, 116 C. Cls. 679, 119 C. Cls. 504, cert. den. 342 U.S. 953 ..... | 8  |
| H. B. Nelson Construction Co. v. United States, 87 C. Cls. 375 .....                              | 8  |
| Hirsch v. United States, 94 C. Cls. 602, 631 .....  | 8  |

|   | Page                    |
|---|-------------------------|
| Kihlberg v. United States, 97 U.S. 398  | 7                       |
| Langevin v. United States, 100 C. Cls. 15   | 8                       |
| Levering and Garrigues Co. v. United States, 71 C. Cls. 739                                     | 8                       |
| Loftis v. United States, 110 C. Cls. 551  | 9                       |
| Louisville & N. C. Co. v. United States, 245 U.S. 463   | 32                      |
| Ma-King Products Co. v. Blair, 271 U.S. 479   | 34                      |
| McShain v. United States, 83 C. Cls. 405  | 8                       |
| Meltzer v. United States, 111 C. Cls. 389   | 8                       |
| Mitchell Canning, Inc. v. United States, 111 C. Cls. 228  | 9                       |
| Mittry, et al. v. United States, 73 C. Cls. 341   | 8                       |
| Myers Co. v. United States, 101 C. Cls. 41  | 9                       |
| National Broadcasting Co. v. United States, 319 U.S. 190  | 32                      |
| Needles v. United States, 101 Ct. Cls. 535  | 9                       |
| Newhall-Herkner v. United States, 116 C. Cls. 419   | 8                       |
| Penner Installation Co. v. United States, 116 C. Cls. 550; 89 F. Supp. 545, aff'd, 340 U.S. 898 | 8, 10                   |
| Pendegast v. Board of Appeals of Barnstable, 331 Mass. 555                                      | 35                      |
| P.R.R. Co. v. United States, 363 U.S. 202   | 38                      |
| Ripley v. United States, 223 U.S. 695   | 7, 9, 19                |
| Ruff v. United States, 96 C. Cls. 148   | 9                       |
| Russell H. Williams v. United States, 130 C. Cls. 435, cert. den. 349 U.S. 938                  | 9                       |
| Southern Shipyards Corp. v. United States, 76 C. Cls. 468                                       | 8                       |
| Tagg Bros. v. United States, 280 U.S. 420   | 32                      |
| United States v. Gleason, 175 U.S. 588  | 7                       |
| United States v. Jones, 336 U.S. 641  | 33, 36                  |
| United States v. Moorman, 338 U.S. 457  | 10                      |
| United States v. Wunderlich, 342 U.S. 98, rev'd. 117 C. Cls. 92                                 | 2, 4, 9, 11, 18, 19, 26 |
| Universal Camera Corp. v. National Labor Rel. Bd., 340 U.S. 474                                 | 11                      |
| Volentine and Littleton v. United States, 136 C. Cls. 638                                       | 7, 8, 21, 30, 39        |
| Wagner Whirler & Derrick Corp. v. United States, 121 F. Supp. 664; 128 C. Cls. 382              | 10, 27                  |

## Index Continued

## STATUTES:

|  | Page                             |
|--|----------------------------------|
| Act of July 19, 1952, 66 Stat. 792 (Patent Office) . . . . .                                     | 28                               |
| Act of Dec. 29, 1950, 64 Stat. 1129; 5 U.S.C. Sections 1031-1042 . . . . .                       | 30, 37                           |
| Administrative Procedure Act, 5 U.S.C. 1001 . . . . .  | 24, 25, 29                       |
| Communications Act of 1934, 48 Stat. 1093 . . . . .  | 32                               |
| Fair Labor Standards Act, 29 U.S.C. 201, 210 . . . . .   | 5, 29, 37                        |
| Federal Trade Commission Act, 15 U.S.C. 41, 45 . . . . .   | 29, 37                           |
| Indian Claims Commission Act, 25 U.S.C. 70, 70g . . . . .  | 29, 36                           |
| Longshoremen and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, 33 U.S.C. 921 . . . . .                       | 29, 31                           |
| National Labor Relations Act, 29 U.S.C. 160 . . . . .  | 5, 29, 37                        |
| Packers and Stockyards Act, 7 U.S.C. 217 . . . . .   | 32                               |
| Private Law 85-306, 85th Cong., H. Rep. 2654 for relief of Martin Wunderlich Company . . . . .   | 26                               |
| Renegotiation Act of 1951, 50 U.S.C. App. 1218 . . . . .   | 13, 28, 33                       |
| Soil Bank Act, 7 U.S.C. 1801, 1831 . . . . .   | 34                               |
| Tucker Act, 28 U.S.C. Section 1491 (4) . . . . .   | 6, 7                             |
| Urgent Deficiencies Act of Oct. 22, 1913, 38 Stat. 208, 28 U.S.C. 2321, <i>et seq.</i> . . . . . | 32                               |
| 49-U.S.C. 17 . . . . .   | 32                               |
| 66 Stat., 537 (1952); re-enacted as Pub. Law No. 179, 83d Cong., 1st Sess. (1953) . . . . .      | 2a                               |
| Wunderlich Act, 68 Stat. 81, 41 U.S.C. 321-322 . . . . .   | 2, 3, 4, 7, 9, 11, 16, 17, 25-28 |

## MISCELLANEOUS:

|   |                          |
|---|--------------------------|
| 98 Cong. Rec. 9433, 9511 (1952) . . . . .   | 2a                       |
| 100 Cong. Rec. 5510-5511, 5717, 5718 . . . . .  | 3a, 17a                  |
| Hearings before House Judiciary Committee on H.R. 1839, and S. 24, H.R. 3634 and H.R. 6946, entitled "Review of Finality Clauses in Government Contracts" 83d Cong., 1st and 2d Sess. . . . . | 13-16, 19, 21-25; 3a-16a |
| Hearings before Subcommittee of Senate Judiciary Committee in S. 2487, entitled "Finality Clauses in Government Contracts" 82d Cong., 2d Sess. . . . .  | 12-17, 21; 3a-16a        |
| H.R. Rep. No. 1685, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. . . . .   | 2a                       |
| H.R. 6404, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. . . . .  | 29                       |
| H.R. 6214, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. . . . .  | 7                        |
| H.R. 6301, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. . . . .  | 7                        |
| H.R. 6338, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. . . . .  | 7                        |

## Index Continued

v

|   | Page               |
|---|--------------------|
| H.R. 3634, 83d Cong., 1st Sess. ....  | 7                  |
| H. Rept. No. 1380, 83d Cong., 2d Sess. ....   | 11, 18-25, 27, 17a |
| S. Rept. No. 32, 83d Cong., 1st Sess. ....  | 2a                 |
| S. Rept. No. 1670, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. ....   | 2a                 |
| S. 2432, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. ....   | 7                  |
| S. 2487, 82d Cong., 2d Sess. ....   | 1a-3a              |
| S. 24, 83d Cong., 1st Sess. ....  | 2a, 3a             |
| Record of hearing before the Corps of Engineers   |                    |
| Claims and Appeals Board (R. 74-165), (R. 80, 81; 138, 141, 159) ....   | 39, 42             |
| Decision of the Appeals Board, R. 167, 176 ....   | 39, 42             |
| Respondent's exhibits 71, 72 before the Court of Claims, R. 183-189; and testimony relating thereto, R. 203, 204, 262; 212-221 .... | 39, 40, 41         |
| Other testimony before Court of Claims (R. 192, 202), (56-64; 203, 205) ....  | 41, 43             |
| Original record before Court of Claims, pp. 1162, 1163, 1187 ....   | 42                 |
| Petition for writ of certiorari ....  | 2                  |

IN THE  
**Supreme Court of the United States**  
OCTOBER TERM, 1962

No. 529

UNITED STATES, *Appellant*

v.

CARLO BIANCHI AND COMPANY, INC., *Respondent*

On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Claims

**BRIEF FOR RESPONDENT**

**QUESTION PRESENTED**

Should the Wunderlich Act be interpreted to require the Court of Claims to restrict its inquiry into the finality of decisions arising under the standard form of Government contract disputes clause to the "administrative record" upon which such decisions might have been based, where the announced purpose of Congress in passing that Act was to overcome the

decision of this Court in *United States v. Wunderlich*, where the Act re-established the rule that such administrative decisions possessed no finality if fraudulent or arbitrary or capricious, or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or not supported by substantial evidence, all of which standards the Court of Claims had uniformly applied on the basis of evidence presented *de novo*.<sup>1</sup>

#### STATUTORY PROVISIONS INVOLVED

The Act of May 11, 1954, 68 Stat. 81 (the Wunderlich Act, 41 U.S.C. 321-322) provides:

**§ 321. Limitation on pleading contract-provisions relating to finality; standards of review.**

No provision of any contract entered into by the United States, relating to the finality or conclusiveness of any decision of the head of any department or agency or his duly authorized representative or board in a dispute involving a question arising under such contract, shall be pleaded in any suit now filed or to be filed as limiting judicial review of any such decision to cases where fraud by such official or his said representative or board is alleged: *Provided, however, That* any such decision shall be final and conclusive unless the same is fraudulent or capricious or arbitrary or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or is not supported by substantial evidence.

<sup>1</sup> It should be noted that the "Question Presented" in the appellant's brief (p. 2) is whether claimant is entitled to present evidence *de novo* on an issue of fact submitted to administrative determination whereas, in the petition for certiorari the "Question Presented" is whether the Court of Claims may upset an administrative decision "without regard to the substantiating evidence before the administrative authority and solely on the basis of evidence present at a *de novo* trial to that court." (Pet. p. 2)

**§ 322. Contract-provisions making decisions final on questions of law.**

No Government contract shall contain a provision making final on a question of law the decision of any administrative official, representative, or board.

**STATEMENT REGARDING FACTS**

The appellant states "The government petitioned for certiorari solely on the important legal question whether the Court of Claims was required to consider the factual determinations of the Board on the basis of the administrative record." The appellant also makes the statement that no issue involving the weighing of evidence is before this Court. App's Br. Footnote p. 20. Nor is any such issue now raised by respondent. Limited reference will hereafter be made to certain facts relating to respondent's contention that no finality can attach to the decision of the Appeals Board by reason of administrative irregularities. With the issues before this Court so narrowed, it is unnecessary for respondent to point out the errors and omissions in appellant's statement of "The Undisputed Facts," nor to discuss the question whether the Board's decision was supported by substantial evidence on the basis of the administrative record or of the record before the Court of Claims. Respondent merely wishes to comment that a study of either or both records amply justifies the decision of the Court of Claims.

**SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT**

The Wunderlich Act, 41 U.S.C. 321, provides that administrative determinations of factual disputes arising out of government contracts are "final and conclusive" unless the determination is "fraudulent or

capricious or arbitrary or so grossly erroneous as necessarily to imply bad faith, or is not supported by substantial evidence." Respondent submits that judicial review of these administrative determinations of fact by the Court of Claims is not restricted to the administrative record.

Nothing in the legislative history of the Wunderlich Act indicates a desire on the part of Congress either to change the jurisdiction of the Court of Claims over contract cases or to change in any way the long standing procedures that had been adopted by the Court of Claims for the review of administrative decisions on the basis of evidence presented *de novo*. Congress was made fully aware of these procedures employed by the Court of Claims and the standards applied.

Congress expressed the purpose of the Wunderlich Act as being "to overcome the effect of the Supreme Court decision in the case of *United States v. Wunderlich* (342 U.S. 98)." Congress was attempting to restore the situation to what it had been prior to the Wunderlich decision, to restore to contractors all the rights they had before this decision. In so doing Congress adopted the views of many witnesses who appeared before the Congressional Committees who testified to that effect.

Congress was informed of the irregularity, and in many instances the inadequacy of the administrative proceedings which took place in advance of the administrative decision and of the necessity for an effective impartial review by the court in the traditional manner in which the Court of Claims had always granted such a review.

There is nothing in the language of the Act to suggest the procedure to be used by the reviewing court in applying the statutory standards. The language indicates no intention on the part of Congress to alter the usual procedures of the Court of Claims permitting presentation of evidence *de novo*. Such procedures, applying similar standards, are frequently employed in reviewing administrative determinations of federal and state officials.

Where Congress intended review to be restricted to the administrative record, whether or not standards for review had been set forth, the statutes involved require the making of an administrative record and provide for other procedural safeguards. E.g., Administrative Procedure Act; Fair Labor Standards Act; National Labor Relations Act. Since Government Contract Boards, unlike most administrative agencies are directly involved as interested parties, it is even more likely that Congress would have provided for such procedural safeguards had it intended to limit review to the administrative record. In the absence of these procedural safeguards, it must be inferred that Congress intended the Court of Claims to continue its procedure of hearing evidence presented *de novo*.

The Appeals Board committed administrative irregularities which fully warranted the Court of Claims to render its decision on the basis of evidence presented *de novo*. The Board considered and relied on material documents not made known to respondent at the time of the hearing and not a part of the Board record. These documents contained damaging statements which respondent had no opportunity to refute before the Board. Respondent became apprised of these documents in the course of preparation for trial, and thus was able to refute before the Court of Claims the dam-